CHAPTER X

AGRICULTURE

The Census of Agriculture provides detailed information on farms, farm operators, farm facilities, and farm products. To get this information with a minimum burden on the farmers supplying it, the questionnaire was varied from State to State.

About two weeks before the census date (April 1), Agriculture Questionnaires were distributed to mail box holders who did not have city-type mail delivery; this was done in all States except North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and in 65 of the 75 counties in Arkansas. An accompanying letter explained who should fill the questionnaire and requested farm operators to answer as many questions as possible before the census enumerator called. Under this procedure, the farm operator knew beforehand what questions would be asked, and he had time to prepare the required information.

Different versions of the Agriculture Questionnaire were prepared, because States differ in the crops and livestock produced within their borders. Rice, for example, is an important crop in some States, but it is not produced at all in others. Some 334 questions were needed to get all the information for the Census of Agriculture, but it would have been wasteful and discouraging to use a questionnaire which included all these questions in every State. Accordingly, the questionnaire for a particular area included only the questions needed for that area. A different questionnaire was set up for each State except the following which were combined as indicated: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island; Massachusetts and Connecticut; North Dakota and South Dakota; Maryland and District of Columbia; North Carolina and South Carolina; Alabama and Mississippi. There were thus 41 variations of the questionnaire for States or groups of States. The number of questions on the individual questionnaires was thus reduced from 334 to 184 for the shortest questionnaire and 229 for the longest.

When the census enumerator called to get population and housing information, he determined whether an Agriculture Questionnaire was required for the place. In the censuses before 1950, enumerators were given a definition of a farm and instructed to enumerate all places which qualified under that definition. Generally, a farm was defined as a place of less than 3 acres on which products valued at $250 or more were produced in the preceding year or a place of 3 or more acres on which farm products were produced in the preceding year. Census enumerators had trouble applying this definition, because both price and amount of production were hard to determine, particularly on marginal places. For the 1950 Census, it was decided to ask the enumerators to fill questionnaires for all places which might qualify as farms. The places to be included as farms would then be determined during office processing. Uniform criteria could be applied more readily in the office than in the field. The criteria used were:

For places of 3 or more acres: value of agricultural products produced (exclusive of products for home gardens) amounted to $150 or more in 1949.

For places of less than 3 acres: value of sales of agricultural products produced amounted to $150 or more in 1949.

Enumerators were instructed to get an Agriculture Questionnaire for all places locally called farms, all places of 3 or more acres, and all places with certain specialized operations. Under this procedure, more than a million questionnaires were filled for places which were not counted as farms during the office processing. About 247,000 of these places--mainly country residences--had some agricultural production but not enough to be considered farms. Most of these would have been counted as farms under the definition used in previous censuses. Some 785,000 questionnaires were rejected because no farm products were produced on the place. Most of these places contained 3 or more acres but had no agricultural operations. About 600,000 of the questionnaires were not filled beyond the first seven questions.

Where an Agriculture Questionnaire was required, the enumerator first asked if the farm operator had received and completed one. If so, the enumerator examined the entries to be sure that they were properly made. If not, the enumerator completed one from information given by the farmer or by another qualified person. About 40 percent of the farm operators had filled their questionnaires, at least in part, before the enumerator called.

Person in Charge, April 1, 1950, and Agricultural Operations (Section I)

The name of the person in charge of farm operations was entered in question 1. He could be owner, manager, or tenant. If a partnership operated the farm, all partners were to be listed. The address of the farmer was given in question 2. These two questions and the number of the questionnaire identified the farm in later handling.

The race of the operator was checked in question 3, and this entry was examined during the editing process. If the enumerator failed to check this item, the supervisor entered the race on the basis of available information, such as the surname of the operator and the race entries for operators on adjoining farms. If "other" race was checked but the surname clearly indicated that the person was of Mexican or European origin, the entry was changed to "White." In 1950, a farm on an Indian reservation was considered to be operated by Indians unless it was reported rented to non-Indians. In previous censuses, farms on Indian reservations were classed as white-operated if the Indian Agent or some other white person was reported as the person in charge.

Age of the operator was to be entered in question 4, but the operator sometimes gave his date of birth instead. Editors converted these dates to years of age.

The other three questions in Section I were inserted so that the person receiving the questionnaire in the mail (or the enumerator) would not fill it out unnecessarily (see Fig. 23). If the answer to question 5, "Is this place a farm?" was, "Yes," he was told to skip questions 6 and 7 and continue filling the questionnaire. If the place was not a farm, he was instructed to give the total acreage in the place (question 6) and then to indicate whether or not certain agricultural operations were carried on (question 7). If the answers to question 7 showed no farming was done on the place, he was instructed, "Do not fill the remainder of this questionnaire." About 600,000 questionnaires were not filled beyond question 7 because of this instruction.

Ownership, Rental Agreement, and Location of Land, April 1, 1950 (Section II)

Identifying the land for which farming activities were to be reported was the chief purpose of Section II. The number of acres in "this place" was obtained by adding land owned to land rented and deducting land rented to others. A farm might consist of two or more separate tracts, even though they were some distance apart. If they were operated as one economic unit, they were to be considered as one farm.

All grazing land was to be included as land in farms, except range open to community use and grazing land used under government permit. Land which was used solely by an operator and for which no rent was paid was to be included with land rented from others. Grazing lands operated by grazing associations were to be returned in the name of the manager in charge.

Land was considered owned by the person in charge even if it was in his wife's name, or if he held it as one of the heirs or as a trustee of an undivided estate. If a partnership was "in

charge," all land owned by any of the partners and operated by the partnership was included. Land operated separately by a partner was to be reported on a separate questionnaire.

Questionnaires for farms reported as operated by hired managers were checked by special editors. A hired manager is paid a salary to operate a farm for the owner, a corporation, an institution, or the like. A caretaker who is not in charge of farming operations is not considered a manager. The editors reviewed the questionnaires for farms reported as operated by hired managers to see if the farm operations were so extensive that the place might be operated by a hired manager. In particular, they looked at the value of farm products produced for sale.

A farm operator was placed into one of the following groups according to the way he held his land:

Full owners owned land but did not rent land from others.

Part owners operated land which they owned and land which they rented from others.

Managers operated farms for others and were paid a wage or salary for their services.

Tenants rented from others or worked on shares for others all the land they operated. They were further classified as follows:

- Cash tenants paid cash as rent, such as $10 an acre or $1,000 for the use of the farm.
- Share-cash tenants paid a part of the rent in cash and a part as a share of the crops or of the livestock or livestock products.
- Crop-share tenants paid only a share of the crops.
- Livestock-share tenants paid a share of the livestock or livestock products. They may or may not also have paid a share of the crops.
- Croppers were crop-share tenants whose landlords furnished all the work power. The landlords either furnished all the work animals or furnished tractor power in lieu of work animals. Croppers usually work under the close supervision of the landlords or their agents, and the land assigned them is often merely a part of a larger enterprise operated as a single unit. Data for croppers were shown only for the Southern States and seven counties in southeastern Missouri.
- Other tenants included those who paid a fixed quantity of any product; those who paid taxes, kept up the land and buildings or kept the landlord in exchange for the use of the land; those who had the use of the land rent free; and others who could not be included in one of the other specified sub-classes.
- Unspecified tenants were those whose rental agreement was not reported.

Farm operators were classified as full owner, part owner, manager or tenant on the basis of the following criteria:

Code	Classification	Work power furnished (Ques. 11)	Cash rent paid (Ques. 12a)	Crop-share paid (Ques. 12b)	Share of livestock or livestock products paid (Ques. 12c)	Other arrangements (Ques. 12d)
8	Cropper	Yes	--	--	--	--
4	Cash	No	Yes	No	No	--
5	Share-cash	No	Yes	Yes in either or both		--
6	Crop-share	No	No	Yes	No	--
7	Livestock-share	No	No	--	Yes	--
9	Other	No	No	No	No	Yes
0	Unspecified	No	No	No	No	No

Tenants were classified into different subgroups according to the entries in questions 11 and 12a-d as follows:

Code	Classification	Acres owned and operated (Ques. 8)	Acres rented (Ques. 9)	Acres managed (Ques. 13)	Other conditions
1	Full owner	Acres	None	None	Acres owned minus acres rented to others equal to acres in farm
2	Part owner	Acres	Acres	None	Acres owned plus acres rented minus acres rented to others equal to acres in farm
3	Manager	--	--	Acres	--
See below	Tenant	None	Acres	None	Acres rented minus acres rented to others equal to acres in farm

If a hired manager operated a farm on his own account, in addition to managing his employer's farm, a separate questionnaire was filled for each farm. The questionnaire for a managed operation was restricted to the land managed.

Sharecroppers were identified by an affirmative answer to question 11, "Does the landlord furnish all the work animals or tractor power as a part of his share in the operation of this place?" This question was asked only in the States where sharecropping is a common method of rental. The other questions in Section II were asked in all States.

A mechanical edit supplemented the verification of punching, which was done on a sample basis, and the coding. This edit disclosed errors and inconsistencies among the entries punched on the cards. A card was corrected if it indicated that a full owner rented land, that a tenant owned land, or that a part owner did not both rent and own land. Cards for different types of tenants could not be checked mechanically.

Duplication in counting farm land was prevented by asking the location of the land (question 16) and whether the operator lived on the farm (question 17). These questions were also used to assign the figures for the farm to the correct geographic area (minor civil division or county). A farm with land in two counties was enumerated in only one. This was the county where the operator lived if he lived on the farm; otherwise, it was the county where the farm headquarters were located. Nevertheless, some cases were found in which the land was enumerated more than once. When a questionnaire indicated that an operator had land in two or more minor civil divisions, the questionnaires in all these divisions were examined and duplicate reports were eliminated.

Data on location of land were used only to eliminate duplication and to determine the correct location of the farm, but those on residence of operator were tabulated. If an answer was not given to this question, no attempt was made to supply it. The difference between the count of all farms and the count of farms classified by residence of operator represents the number of farms for which the answer was not given.

Some farm operators live in nearby villages and operate their farms from the dwelling in the village. These operators were considered to be living on their farms if they carried on some agricultural operations at their residences. Other operators live on the farm only a part of the year, so the date of enumeration may influence the figures; thus, differences in enumeration dates may affect the comparability of residence figures for different censuses.

Crops Harvested in 1949 (Section III)

Every crop harvested in 1949 was to be reported on the Agriculture Questionnaire either in a separate question or in one of the "all other" questions. These crops were to be reported for the land in the farm whether the present operator or someone

else harvested them, and whether they were harvested by one method or another. The land was to be reported once for each crop harvested. For example, acreage was reported only once if hay was cut twice on it; but it was reported twice if two different crops were grown in succession or were interplanted. When it was reported twice, the enumerator was asked to note this in Section IV to get a correct total of cropland harvested.

For some crops, such as corn, sorghums, and hay, acreage was reported not only for the total crop but also for each kind or each use to which it was put. Enumerators were instructed to check the sum of the acreages reported for each kind or use with the total. These totals were again checked and corrected during the editing process, but no change was made if the difference was small.

The system of entering a total acreage for the crop as well as acreages for each kind evidently confused some enumerators. The small grains group provided for no such total, but these enumerators entered a total in the last question, which was for acreage of "other grain." These incorrect totals were edited out.

All sales of farm products from the farm were to be reported regardless of who shared in the receipts. For example, the landlord's share of the crop was considered sales from the tenant farm. Sales of crops grown on a contract basis were reported as sales from the farm. Thus, the value of sales represented gross income for the farm and not necessarily for the farm operator.

Sales were defined to include certain other transactions. Farm products traded for groceries or given in exchange for services, such as baling hay, were regarded as sold. On institutional farms, such as county poor farms, products for the use of inmates were considered sold. Government payments for specific crops were also included in sales.

To facilitate reporting of potatoes grown in small plots for home use, enumerators were instructed to report bushels but not acreage for those plots if less than 15 bushels were harvested. No effort was made to estimate the acreage for these plots. Consequently, acreage of potatoes harvested is somewhat underreported, especially in areas where they are grown primarily for home use.

A count of farms harvesting vegetables for home use constitutes the only information concerning home gardens in the 1950 Census.

Information on the quantity of vegetables sold is difficult to get, because they are not marketed in uniform units but are sold in many kinds and sizes of containers. In 1950, questions were asked regarding the acreage of the most important vegetable crops harvested for sale in the State, and space was provided on the questionnaire for writing in the names and acreages of vegetables for which no separate inquiry was made.

The Agriculture Questionnaire included three inquiries regarding horticultural-specialty crops. A master list of horticultural-specialty establishments was prepared before the enumeration and was given to enumerators, Crew Leaders, and District Supervisors. They used this list to check the completeness of the returns on the Agriculture Questionnaires. The questionnaires, in turn, were used in Washington to correct the master list. The special census of horticultural-specialty establishments was taken by mailing questionnaires (A 11, A 12, A 13, or A 14) to producers on the master list.

Units of measure for the crops varied by kind of crop and by geographic area in accord with local custom. Rice, for example, was reported in 100-pound bags in California, in 162-pound barrels in Texas and Louisiana, and in bushels in Arkansas. This variation created problems both in planning the questionnaire and in preparing the data for publication. Enumerators were given conversion factors so they could change the production from one unit to another (for example, 45 pounds of rice equals 1 bushel), and some of these factors were printed on the questionnaire. Despite precautions, entries were sometimes made in the wrong unit of measure. Corn harvested for grain, for example, was sometimes reported in baskets of ear corn instead of bushels of shelled corn; sorghum harvested for grain or seed was sometimes reported in tons of heads instead of bushels of grain.

The mechanical edit detected some incorrect units of measure, as well as punching and other errors. In that edit, reports with unusually high or low production per acre were listed. For example, 100 bushels or more of corn per acre was regarded high. If this could not be explained by other information, possible errors were investigated. On cash crops, such as cotton and tobacco, production was also related to the value of the amount sold. For other crops, like corn, the amount sold and the value of the amount sold were both reported, so a price per unit could be computed. If the prices derived from these computations were not within the range of actual market prices for those crops, the editors looked for errors in punching, in units of measure, and in enumeration. Another test was whether the amount sold (when given) was greater than the amount produced.

Because units of measure varied by geographic location, quantities for a given crop had to be converted into a common unit to get United States totals. Peaches, for example, were converted from tons or pounds into bushels (see Table G). Standard weights and measures were used to convert the reported quantities for these as well as other crops.

The production of cottonseed in 1949 was calculated from the reports on the production of lint cotton, using ratios appropriate to each area.

Value of the crop harvested and value of the amount sold were both reported in the final publications. Value of the amount sold was obtained during enumeration, but value of the crop harvested was computed by multiplying the quantity harvested for each crop, county by county, by unit prices. Unit prices were obtained cooperatively by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Census.

A complete list of the crops covered by specific questions and the forms of the questionnaire for which the specific items appeared can be seen in the master listing of items in the appendix.

Land Use in 1949
(Section IV)

Land in farms may be used for crops, pasture, or other agricultural purposes; it may be wasteland; or it may be used for houses, lanes, roads, or other purposes which are not strictly agricultural. To find out how much land was used for farm production, enumerators were instructed to classify all "acres in this place" according to their use in 1949.

The land use classes were:

- Cropland harvested (land in crops, hay, orchards, nurseries or greenhouses)
- Cropland used only for pasture (rotation pasture and all other cropland used only for pasture)
- Cropland not harvested and not pastured (idle cropland, land in soil-improvement crops only, land on which all crops failed, land seeded to crops for harvest after 1949, and cultivated summer fallow). In 17 Western States, information for cultivated summer fallow was obtained separately.
- Woodland pastured (all woodland used for pasture or grazing but not brush pasture)
- Woodland not pastured
- Other pasture (not cropland and not woodland--usually rough and brush land)
- Other land (house lots, barn lots, lanes, roads, ditches, and wasteland).

These classes were mutually exclusive. That is, each acre of land was counted in only one category although it may have had more than one use in 1949.

The total acreage, as indicated above, was the land owned plus the land rented minus the land rented out. Acreage used for the various purposes were to add to this total. Cropland harvested, one of the more difficult figures to get if not readily known to the operator, was obtained by adding acreages reported in Section III for the individual crops; acreage which was reported twice because it produced two crops was counted only once. The section on land use was placed after the crop section on the questionnaire so that the enumerator could more easily make these computations.

Editors checked the land use figures on the individual questionnaires and corrected discrepancies of more than 5 acres. These discrepancies occurred not only between the total acreage and the sum of acreages used for different purposes, but also between total cropland harvested and the sum of acreages for different crops. On the final figures for each county, the sum of acreages of different crops grown in that county was checked against the total acreage from which crops were harvested.

Some woodland and wasteland were excluded from the tabulations of land in farms. Large tracts of timber land were excluded when they were reported as woodland not pastured and when they evidently were held primarily for nonagricultural purposes. If less than 10 percent of the acreage of a large farm was used for crops, pasture, and grazing, the acreages for wasteland and woodland not grazed were added; if the combined acreage was larger than the acreage for agricultural purposes, the excess was excluded.[1]

[1] See page 7 for definition of large farm.

Table G. --Factors Used in Converting Fruit and Nut Quantities from the Units of Measure Enumerated in Specified States to the Units Selected for Showing Totals for the United States

Crop	Unit shown in the tables in this volume	Other units specified on the questionnaire and published in Volume I, by States		Conversion factor
		State	Unit	
Almonds	Pound	California	Ton	1 ton=2,000 pounds.
Apples	Bushel	California	do	1 ton=41.67 bushels (bushel=48 pounds).
		Oregon	Loose box	Loose box=¾ bushel.[1]
		Washington	do	Do.[1]
Apricots	do	California	Ton	1 ton=41.67 bushels.
		Idaho	Pound	48 pounds=1 bushel.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Cherries	Pound	California	Ton	1 ton=2,000 pounds.
Figs	Pound, fresh weight	California	Ton, dry weight	1 ton (2,000 pounds), dry weight=6,000 pounds, fresh weight.
Grapes	Pound	California	Ton.[2]	1 ton=2,000 pounds.
Grapefruit	Ton	Arizona	Field box	44.44 field boxes=1 ton (field box=45 pounds).[1]
		California	do	44.44 field boxes=1 ton (field box=45 pounds).
		Florida	do	24.39 field boxes=1 ton (field box=82 pounds).
		Louisiana	do	40 field boxes=1 ton (field box=50 pounds).[1]
		Alabama	do	40 field boxes=1 ton (field box=50 pounds).
		Georgia	do	Do.
		Mississippi	do	Do.
		South Carolina	do	Do.
Oranges, all	do	Arizona	do	37.74 field boxes=1 ton (field box=53 pounds).
		Florida	do	22.22 field boxes=1 ton (field box=90 pounds).
		Louisiana	do	28.57 field boxes=1 ton (field box=70 pounds).
		Alabama	do	35.71 field boxes=1 ton (field box=56 pounds).
		Georgia	do	Do.
		Mississippi	do	Do.
		South Carolina	do	Do.
Valencia	do	California	do	38.09 field boxes=1 ton (field box=52.5 pounds).
Navel and miscellaneous	do	California	do	39.60 field boxes=1 ton (field box=50.5 pounds).
Peaches	Bushel	California	Ton	1 ton=41.67 bushels (bushel=48 pounds).
		Oregon	Pound	48 pounds=1 bushel.
		Washington	do	Do.
Pears	do	California	Ton	1 ton=41.67 bushels (bushel=48 pounds).
		Oregon	do	1 ton=40 bushels (bushel=50 pounds).
		Washington	do	Do.
Plums and prunes	do	California	Ton, fresh weight for plums; ton, dry weight for prunes.	1 ton=35.71 bushels (bushel=56 pounds). / 1 ton (2,000 pounds), dry weight=89.27 bushels fresh weight (bushel=56 pounds; 1 pound dry prunes=2½ pounds fresh).
Blackberries and dewberries	Quart	California	Pound	1½ pounds=1 quart.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Blueberries (tame)	do	California	do	Do.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Boysenberries, loganberries, and youngberries	do	California	do	Do.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Cranberries	Pound	Connecticut	100-pound barrel	100-pound barrel=100 pounds.[1]
		Massachusetts	do	Do.
Currants	Quart	California	Pound	1½ pounds=1 quart.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Gooseberries	do	California	do	Do.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Raspberries	do	California	do	Do.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
Strawberries	do	California	do	Do.
		Oregon	do	Do.
		Washington	do	Do.
		Arkansas	24-qt. crate	24-quart crate=24 quarts.
		Louisiana	24-pt. crate	24-pint crate=12 quarts.

[1] Consideration of additional data on unit weights led to some changes in conversion factors for 1950 Census data shown in Table 2 from factors used to convert production for 1945 and earlier years in the State bulletins. The unrevised factors used for converting 1945 data in State bulletins are: Grapefruit—field box=48 pounds for Arizona and 62 pounds for Louisiana. Apples—loose box=⅝ bushel for Oregon and Washington. For 1940 and earlier years: Cranberries—1 quart=1½ pounds for Massachusetts and Connecticut.

[2] In California, the 1950 questionnaire provided for reporting raisin grape production on either dry-weight or fresh-weight basis. Reports of dry weight were converted at the rate of 1 pound raisins to 4 pounds fresh grapes.

Source: 1950 Census of Agriculture, Vol. II, Table 2.

Grazing lands were excluded only when they were open range or when they were used under Government permit. All other grazing lands were included as land in farms.

The entries for land use on the punch cards were checked mechanically. If any subgroup exceeded the total or if any total was more than 10 times the largest subgroup, the entries were examined.

Farms were classified by size according to the total land area in the farm. The size code was entered on the questionnaire by the editors and was punched on all cards. It was checked mechanically at the same time the land distribution was checked.

The size classification was as follows:

Acreage group	Code	Acreage group	Code
0 to 9 acres	1	140 to 179 acres	7
10 to 29 acres	2	180 to 219 acres	8
30 to 49 acres	3	220 to 259 acres	9
50 to 69 acres	4	260 to 499 acres	0
70 to 99 acres	5	500 to 999 acres	X
100 to 139 acres	6	1,000 acres and over	V

Year Began Operation, Off-Farm Work, and Other Income in 1949 (Section V)

Year Began Operation

The year in which the farmer began continuous operation of his present farm or any part of it was to be entered. Thus, if he returned to a place he had previously operated, he was to report the date he began operations anew. The month was also given if he began to operate the farm after 1944.

Off-Farm Work and Other Income

Many farm operators do other work in addition to farming. They may work for wages on someone else's farm or they may work at nonfarm jobs. They may operate filling stations, tourist camps or other businesses or professions away from their farms. Their nonfarm employment may be secondary or it may represent their principal employment. An increasing number of farmers are finding part- or full-time employment off their farms. Also, many persons employed in cities are living in rural areas and may have sufficient agricultural activities to qualify their places of residence as farms.

To determine the extent to which farm operators supplemented their farm income with other income, the following questions were asked:

OFF-FARM WORK AND OTHER INCOME:

218. How many days did you work last year off your farm? Include work at a nonfarm job, business, profession, or on someone else's farm . . (*Check one*) (Do not include exchange work.)
(1) ☐ None
(2) ☐ 1 to 49 days
(3) ☐ 50 to 99 days
(4) ☐ 100 to 199 days
(5) ☐ 200 days or more

219. Did any other member of your family living with you have a nonfarm job, business, profession, or work on someone else's farm last year? . . . . . ☐ No ☐ Yes

220. Did you have any income last year from any of the following sources—sale of products from land rented out, cash rent, boarders, old-age assistance, pensions, veterans' allowances, unemployment compensation, interest, and help from members of your family? . . . ☐ No ☐ Yes

If "None" for question 218 and "No" for both questions 219 and 220, skip to question [222].

221. Was the income which you and your family received from work off the farm and from other sources (listed in questions 218, 219, and 220) greater than the total value of all agricultural products sold from your place last year? . . . . . ☐ No ☐ Yes

The enumerator was instructed to report only the off-farm work for which cash was received; exchange work was to be excluded. In addition to other uses, the data helped to determine the economic class of the farm when the value of products sold was between $250 and $1,199 (see page X-28).

Irrigation (Section VI)

Irrigation is the control and application of water to the land for agricultural purposes by any means other than natural rainfall.

Two different sets of irrigation questions were used on the Agriculture Questionnaires. In States with little irrigated land, only two questions were asked:

Of the total land in this place, how many acres were IRRIGATED last year? ..... (_) None _____ (Acres)

How many acres in this place were irrigated by sprinklers last year? (_) None _____ (Acres)

The answers to these questions were punched directly on the punch card without coding.

In Florida, Arkansas, Louisiana, and the 17 Western States, irrigation is more extensively practiced; so more data were collected. In addition to the two questions above, questions were asked on the acreage of irrigated land used for crops, for pasture or grazing, and for other purposes. Names and acreages of individual crops wholly or partly irrigated were listed. The farm operator gave the name of the enterprise supplying the water and the number of acres to which it was applied.

From this information, the editors classified and coded the farms according to extent of irrigation, as follows:

	Code
All harvested crops irrigated	1
Part of the harvested crops irrigated	2
Only the pasture irrigated	3

Crops raised on a partially irrigated farm were also coded to indicate the extent of irrigation of the crop, as follows:

Wholly irrigated (300 was added to the crop code)
Partly irrigated (600 was added to the crop code)
Not irrigated (the crop code was not changed)

Crops on wholly irrigated farms did not have to be specially coded, because the card for each crop carried the farm irrigation code.

Irrigation entries on the punch cards for all States were mechanically edited. Acreage irrigated was checked against the size of the farm.

If the county figures appeared to be seriously inconsistent, the acreage of all cropland irrigated in the county was compared to the sum of the acreages of different crops irrigated. Discrepancies were detected and explained or corrected.

The irrigation questions on the Agriculture Questionnaires for the 17 Western States and for Florida, Arkansas, and Louisiana were used for the Census of Irrigation. From these questions, the regular enumerator determined whether the farm operated its own irrigation works and he was to fill an I-1 Questionnaire for the Census of Irrigation, or whether the farm used water supplied by an irrigation enterprise and a special enumerator was to fill an I-2 Questionnaire for that enterprise. The names of suppliers of water entered on the Agriculture Questionnaires were used to check the list of such suppliers compiled from the 1940 Census of Irrigation. In this way, practically complete coverage of irrigation enterprises was secured. Moreover, acreages reported by these enterprises on the I-2 Questionnaire were checked with the acreages reported by the farmers on the Agriculture Questionnaires.

Forest Products in 1949 (Section VII)

Forest products sold by the farmer as standing timber and cut by the buyer were to be reported only in dollar value. Forest products cut by the farmer, however, were to be reported in physical measurements (cords, board feet, number); if any were sold, sales value was also to be reported.

Occasionally, a buyer of standing timber pays a certain amount for each thousand board feet of logs that he cuts from the farmer's woodland. Such situations confused some enumerators. They properly entered the amount received from the sale of the standing timber, but they improperly entered the number of board feet of logs cut. The editor deleted the board feet entry if the money received for standing timber appeared to be about the right amount for the number of board feet reported. Problem cases were referred to a subject-matter specialist.

Problems other than double entries appeared. In some cases, thousands of board feet were entered, instead of board feet. In others, forest products were reported cut when the farmer had no woodland or insufficient woodland to produce the amount reported. A subject-matter specialist who was familiar with the practices in the area resolved such cases. Sometimes, the farmer operated a sawmill and cut logs brought from other farms; sometimes, he reported products cut from a farm he operated in 1948; or he reported products cut from a farm he owned but did not operate.

A final question in this section was asked to determine the amount received from the sale of miscellaneous forest products not specifically covered in the previous questions. Some farm operators and enumerators evidently thought this was a question on total amount received for all forest products, because they entered amounts large enough to include sales previously reported. Entries in this question were carefully edited.

Double entries sometimes appeared in the questions on maple trees and products. These questions were asked only in the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Maryland. Some enumerators reported the pounds of maple sugar produced and also the gallons of sirup from which the sugar originated. Reports of both sirup and sugar were considered correct if the operator made both products; but if the production per tree was high and the sales value was low, the entries for sirup and sugar obviously overlapped. The editor reduced or deleted the entry for sirup in these cases.

Editors discovered and eliminated many errors and inconsistencies; but a mechanical edit was needed to detect additional cases of inconsistency and to identify large entries for further review. In this process, punch cards were listed if they had entries both for standing timber sold and for forest products (other than firewood) cut. Punch cards which showed sales both of standing timber and of specific products were also listed. In addition, the edit disclosed other enumerating, punching, and editing errors. A technician specifically trained for this procedure inspected the listed cases; then the questionnaires were given to the editors for further examination.

Pasture Receipts (and Grazing Permits) in 1949 (Section VIII)

The Agriculture Questionnaire for all States carried the question, "How much was received last year from the sale of pasture or grazing privileges?" A parenthetical note under the question indicated that this was to be for "livestock pastured for others on a per-head basis, at so much per month, etc." Pasture land rented on a per-acre basis was not to be included; such land was to be enumerated as rented to others, because its control passed from the owner to the renter.

Farm operators and enumerators sometimes entered in this question the money received from the rent of land on a per-acre basis. Such errors were detected because the amount received was large in relation to the acres of pasture land operated by the farmer and reported in Section IV. A technician examined all entries of $5,000 or more for pasture receipts to be sure that they were correct.

Farmers and ranchers in 11 Western States were asked whether they held grazing permits from the U. S. Forest Service or some other public agency. Enumerators were cautioned not to confuse land leased on a per-acre basis with land used under a permit on a per-head basis. Leased land should be reported as part of the "land in this place."

Public lands used for grazing under permit were not to be included in the acreage of land in farms. Grazing land not in farms was estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture. This estimate included federally owned lands grazed under permit and also any other public and privately owned grazing lands which were not included with the farm land areas.

Except for punching, the questions on pasture receipts and grazing permits gave very little trouble in processing. The punch card operators were specifically instructed to punch an "X" in the column for grazing permits in States where the question was omitted. This was occasionally forgotten. Since the next items to be punched on the cards were number of mules and number of horses, part of the data on mules was often punched in the column for grazing permits. Example A, below, shows how 10 mules might have been recorded as none; Example B shows how 19 mules and 16 horses might have been punched as 90 mules and 160 horses, because the operator forgot to punch the "X" for grazing permits.

Example A	Grazing permit (Col. 23)	Mules (Col. 24-25)	Horses (Col. 26-28)
Reported on questionnaire	No question	10	None
Correct punching.....	X	10	X
As punched incorrectly...	1	0X	
Example B			
Reported on questionnaire	No question	19	16
Correct punching.....	X	19	016
As punched incorrectly...	1	90	160

These errors were discovered because grazing permits ("1" was the code for "Yes") appeared in States where the question was not asked, and more horses and mules were reported than were expected.

Livestock on This Place, April 1, 1950, and Livestock Production in 1949 (Section IX)

In the livestock inventory, all livestock on the place were to be reported regardless of who owned them. Also to be reported were livestock owned by the farm operator but not on the place because they were grazing on public land or open range. Of course, livestock owned by the farm operator but kept by some other person were not to be reported; the other person would report them on his questionnaire because they were on his place.

The value of the livestock inventory was not reported on the Agriculture Questionnaire, but it was computed for each county during the processing operations. The number of each kind of animals in the county was multiplied by the average value per head. The average values per head were compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Value of sales of livestock and livestock products were reported on the Agriculture Questionnaire. All sales from "this place" were to be reported regardless of ownership. For example, a farmer who fed cattle for another person should report the sales made by that person. On the other hand, a farmer who recently moved to "this place" was asked to report livestock sales from the place he previously operated. The reason for this exception to the usual reporting for "this place" was that in most cases the farmer takes his livestock with him when he moves. If the operator had not farmed in 1949, sales for "this place" were to be estimated.

The inventory items for horses and mules gave no trouble except in the punching process. Punching the figures for mules in the column for grazing permits was described above. In addition, allocation of three columns for punching the number of horses and only two columns for mules confused some card punch operators, so that they failed to put the proper number of 0's before the unit for horses. Thus, two horses and two mules should have been punched "02 002" in columns 24-28; but it was sometimes punched "02 02X." The 2X entry, unless corrected, would have been tabulated as 20 horses.

The total cattle on the place should equal the sum of the number of cows, young calves, older female calves, and older bulls and steers. The enumerator was required to check this total and usually did, except when the respondent could give the total but not the distribution by age and sex. In such cases, the editors estimated that distribution. The number of cows could be approximated if the farmer reported the number of cows milked or the number of milk cows on the place. In addition, the editor examined other information on the questionnaire--the number of cattle and calves sold alive and the amount spent for the purchase of livestock and poultry. Reports for nearby farms also furnished clues to the distribution.

Occasionally, a farm operator reported that some cows were milked, but reported no milk produced; or he reported no cows were milked but some milk was produced. These entries were edited by comparing them with those for nearby farms.

Three alternative units of measure for whole milk sales were provided in questionnaires for 26 States (chiefly Western and Midwestern). They were: (1) pounds of milk, (2) pounds of butterfat, and (3) gallons of milk. In other States, the unit, pounds of butterfat, was omitted because milk was rarely sold in that way.

Pounds of butterfat reported for each county were converted to either pounds or gallons of milk, depending on the unit used in most reports in the State. For this purpose, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture provided estimates of the butterfat content of whole milk in different sections of the country. Gallons of milk were converted to pounds of milk by multiplying total gallons by 8.6.

The question on cream sold was the same for all States. Cream was to be reported in pounds of butterfat, and the conversion factor for cream sold by the gallon--$2\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of butterfat per gallon of cream--was printed on the questionnaire.

The mechanical edit compared the total number of cattle with the sum of the numbers in the age-sex groups, cows milked with total milk cows, and milk production with number of cows milked.

From the amount of dairy products sold and the amount of money received, a price per unit was computed; this was checked against prevailing prices. The machines were wired to list extremely large entries; the editors checked these entries to see if they were unreasonable.

The total number of hogs and pigs on the place should equal the sum of those under 4 months old and those 4 months old and over. If it did not, the editors corrected or supplied the information from other entries on the questionnaire and from reports for nearby farms. The relationship between figures for sows and sales of hogs was used in this process.

Similarly, where the total number of sheep did not equal the sum of the figures reported for lambs, ewes (yearling and older) and rams and wethers, the editor corrected the entries. In making corrections, he referred particularly to sales of sheep and number of sheep shorn.

In the seven States where goats were important, several questions were asked--number and kind of goats, mohair clipped, and sale of goat milk and mohair. In the other States, only a general question on the presence or absence of goats was asked.

In summary, procedures for checking livestock inventory were generally similar, whether the animals were cattle, sheep, goats, or hogs. The editors looked at the entries for relevant questions on the questionnaire and examined reports for nearby farms. If the differences were small, the figures were adjusted at the county or minor civil division level; if they were large, the individual questionnaire and punch card were corrected. A large report was always checked. Differences between the total and the sum of the parts, which were disclosed in the mechanical edit, sometimes resulted from errors in punching.

The questions on animals sold alive were the same for all States. They asked for the numbers of hogs, cattle, calves, sheep, and horses and mules sold and the value of the sales. Editors evaluated these figures by computing the price per head and comparing it with the prevailing prices. On farms where the livestock were bred instead of purchased, the sales items were related to the female breeding stock. Thus, the number of cattle and calves sold was related to the number of cows on hand, sheep and lambs sold to ewes on hand, hogs and pigs sold to sows farrowed. That check could not be used, however, for farms with feeder cattle or pigs. For those farms, the number sold was related to the number on hand, to the expenditures for feed and purchases of livestock, and to the amount of feed produced on the farm. For the mechanical edit, the machines listed impossible and inconsistent cases, price per head for each kind of livestock sold, mispunched cards, and extremely large entries.

Farm butchering of hogs, cattle, and calves was reported in all States, and slaughter of sheep in 12 States. Large entries were listed for checking in the mechanical edit.

Poultry and poultry products questions were uniform for all States. Inventory questions related to the number of chickens and turkeys 4 months old and over--not the younger ones. Sales questions asked for the number of chickens sold in 1949 (not counting baby chicks), the number of chicken eggs sold, and the total amount received from the sale of turkeys, ducks, geese, and their eggs. The number of turkeys raised in 1949 and the number of ducks, geese, and other poultry (not counting chickens and turkeys) raised were also to be reported.

Most enumerators followed the rules for the poultry questions. Some, however, reported broilers (chickens under 4 months old) on broiler farms in the inventory question; these errors were detected because no eggs were sold. Others reported the value of sales of all poultry products in the question on sales

TABLE H.--Items for Livestock and Livestock Products for Which Data Were Obtained, Census of 1950

Subject	Date of census and item
	CENSUS OF 1950 (Apr. 1)
Horses	Total, all ages, including ponies.
Mules	Total, all ages.
Cattle	Total, all ages; cows, including heifers that have calved; milk cows; calves born after Jan. 1, 1950; heifers and heifer calves born before Jan. 1, 1950 (not including any that have calved); and bulls, bull calves, steers and steer calves born before Jan. 1, 1950; and numbers of cattle and of calves butchered, and sold alive, 1949.
Dairy products	Cows milked yesterday, gallons of milk produced yesterday; and pounds of butter churned last week; amount of whole milk sold in 1949 in pounds of butterfat (in certain States) in pounds of milk, and in gallons; cream sold (butterfat content) in 1949; and value only of butter, buttermilk, skim milk, and cheese sold in 1949.
Hogs and pigs	Total, all ages; number less than 4 months old, and number 4 months old and over; sows and gilts that have farrowed since Dec. 1, 1949, and sows and gilts expected to farrow between now and June 1, 1950; and numbers butchered, and sold alive.
Sheep and wool	Total, all ages; lambs born since Oct. 1, 1949, rams and wethers born before Oct. 1, 1949, and ewes (in range States--yearling ewes, and older ewes) born before Oct. 1, 1949; sheep and lambs shorn and pounds of wool produced, 1949; sheep sold alive, and (in range States) sheep and lambs butchered.
Goats and mohair	In 7 States--total, all ages; numbers of Angora and of other goats clipped and pounds mohair produced in 1949. In other States--farms reporting goats on hand or kept last year.
Poultry	Numbers, 4 months old and over of chickens and turkeys; numbers raised in 1949 of turkeys, ducks, geese, guineas, pigeons, pheasants, quail, etc.; number of chickens sold, and dozens of chicken eggs sold in 1949.
Bees and honey	Hives of bees owned last year, and pounds of honey produced in 1949.
Miscellaneous items	Number of horses and mules sold in 1949; farms reporting domestic rabbits on hand or kept last year; farms reporting fur animals in captivity on hand or kept last year; and (in range States) farms reporting grazing permits.
Value of livestock and products	Values of sales were obtained in 15 inquiries in 41 States and in 16 inquiries in the 7 States in which the number of goats was enumerated. Separate values were obtained for cattle sold, calves sold, hogs and pigs sold; sheep and lambs sold, and horses and mules sold; whole milk sold, cream sold, and butter, buttermilk, skim milk, and cheese sold; wool shorn, chickens sold, and chicken eggs sold. Other inquiries included the value of sales of groups of related items--meat, lard, hides and other products from animals butchered; turkeys, turkey eggs, ducks, geese, and their eggs sold; honey, wax and bees sold; mohair clipped and goats and kids and goat milk sold; and rabbits, fur animals, and pelts sold. In 41 States, the last 2 inquiries are combined. Values of inventories, 1950, are based on county-unit prices obtained in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

Expenditures in 1949 (Section XII)

Farmers reported amounts spent in 1949 for: machine hire; hired labor; feed for livestock and poultry; purchase of livestock and poultry; gasoline, other petroleum fuel and oil; seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees; tractor repairs; and farm machinery repairs. If the land was rented, amounts spent by the landlord for these purposes were to be included.

Machine hire referred to custom machine work such as tractor hire, threshing, combining, silo filling, baling, ginning, plowing and spraying. If payment was made in farm products, the value of the products was to be reported as the amount spent.

Only cash payments were to be reported in the item for hired labor. The value of perquisites furnished was not to be included.

Expenditures for feed included not only those for grain, hay, and millfeeds, but also those for pasture, salt, condiments, concentrates, and mineral supplements.

Amounts spent for livestock and poultry included those for baby chicks, poults, chickens, turkeys, domestic rabbits, fur-bearing animals kept in captivity, and bees, as well as those for horses, mules, cattle, hogs, sheep, oxen, and goats.

Expenditures for gasoline, other petroleum fuel and oil included only the purchases made for the farm business. Amounts for seeds, bulbs, plants and trees represented only the cash outlay.

Expenditures for tractors and other farm machinery repairs included the amount spent for repair parts, tires, tubes, plowshares, batteries, and other replacement parts as well as the amount spent for repairing. Expenditures for automobiles and motortruck repairs were not to be included.

In the mechanical edit, punch cards were listed if they showed: $2,000 spent for hired labor but no hired workers; any expenditure of $20,000 or more; and any expenditure of $5,000 or more on a farm with income of less than $5,000. Cards which were mispunched in an "X" position and trailer cards incorrectly punched were also listed.

When punch cards showed high expenditures, the questionnaires were examined to see if the amounts could be explained. A large sum for hired labor or machine hire would be reasonable if the farm income was high and if the crops and livestock produced required mechanical equipment or hired labor. High expenditures for feed or livestock might be explained by the number and kinds of livestock sold and the feed crops produced. If gasoline expenditures were high, acres of cropland harvested and crops raised were examined. Large sums spent for seeds, bulbs, plants and trees were often explained by figures on plantings, crops produced and income. High expenditures for tractor and other farm machinery repairs were related to gross farm income, acres of cropland harvested, type of farm and number of tractors and other equipment on the farm.

Miscellaneous Information (Section XIII)

The distance to the trading center visited most frequently, the kind of road on which the farm was located, and the financial characteristics of the farm were reported in the final section of the Agriculture Questionnaire.

Total distance to the trading center and distance over dirt or unimproved road were both given. The kind of road on which the farm was located was to be described in one of three ways: hard surface; gravel, shell, or shale; or dirt or unimproved. Sometimes, a farm operator reported travel over a dirt or unimproved road to get to the trading center, but he reported that his farm was located on a higher class of road (hard surface, or gravel, shell, or shale). This situation may have been due to (a) reporting distance traveled over a dirt or unimproved road within the farm boundaries to reach the road adjoining the farm, (b) reporting travel over dirt or unimproved road after leaving the road adjoining the farm, or (c) reporting travel over a gravel, shell, or shale road as travel over a dirt or unimproved road.

Value of the land and buildings was reported separately for owned land, rented land, managed land, and land rented to others. The value was to be the approximate amount for which the land and buildings would sell and not the assessed value or the price in a forced sale. Institutional buildings were not to be reported; neither were buildings used for nonagricultural purposes, such as filling stations and tourist cabins. Plants for processing materials produced on the farm, however, were to be included.

Mortgage debt on owned land included farm mortgages, deeds of trust, deeds to secure debt, purchase money mortgages, vendors liens (deed with vendor), land purchase contracts, and bonds for deed. Only the amount remaining to be paid was to be reported. Instruments not to be included in mortgage debt were: crop liens, mechanics liens, judgments, mortgages on livestock or machinery or other personal property items (chattel mortgages), promissory notes or delinquent taxes.

Property taxes paid were to include both real estate and personal property taxes, but the real estate taxes were reported separately. These taxes were not to include: assessments for irrigation or drainage, income taxes, sales taxes, poll taxes, automobile fees and licenses, or any property taxes from previous years. Tax information was tabulated only for owner-operators who replied to the tax inquiries and also reported the value of the owned land and buildings.

Rent paid for land rented from others included only the cash rent; the value of farm products paid as rent was not to be reported. When the cash rent represented only a part of the total rental, the reports were excluded from the tabulations; this occurred when a part of the farm was rented for cash and a part was rented for a share of the crops or livestock. Under the same rules, part owners paying both cash and a share of the products as rent were excluded from the tabulations. Part owners were included, however, when both the amount of cash rent and the value of rented land and buildings were reported.

Inconsistencies and unusual cases listed during the mechanical edit were: a value but no acreage reported; a value of $1 or less per acre; value of land and buildings $1,000 or more per acre of land and total value $30,000 or more; property taxes equal to 10 percent or more of value; mortgage debt greater than value; real estate taxes greater than personal property taxes and real estate taxes combined; and cash rent paid by full owners, managers, or tenants other than cash or share-cash tenants.

To get the average value of farm land and buildings per acre, the value of land and buildings shown in complete reports was divided by the number of acres in those reports. A report was considered complete if both the acreage and the value of the land and buildings were entered. The average value of land and buildings per farm was computed by dividing the value of the land and buildings shown in the complete reports by the number of those reports.

Work Power

Work power on farms was expressed in terms of the number of tractors and the number of horses and/or mules. Farms were classified in one of the following groups:

No tractor, horses, or mules
No tractor and only 1 horse or mule
No tractor and 2 or more horses and/or mules
Tractor and 1 or more horses and/or mules
Tractor and no horses or mules

To get the work power data, the number of horses and mules had to be punched on the same card (the L card) as the number of tractors. Accordingly, the figure for horses and mules was transcribed from the livestock section of the questionnaire to a position between questions 332 and 333. There, the punch card operator could get it more easily.

In the analysis of the tabulations, an adjustment was made in the work power data to make them consistent with the number of farms reporting horses and/or mules. The adjustment changed some farms from the second to the third group listed above or from the third to the second. The total adjustment was less than 1 percent, on the average, and it had no significant effect on the total for either group. It had no effect at all, of course, on the total of the two groups--farms with no tractors and with one or more horses and/or mules.

Economic Class of Farm

Farms were grouped in economic classes on the basis of three factors: (1) total value of all farm products sold, (2) number of days the farm operator worked off the farm in 1949, and (3) the relationship of the nonfarm income of the family to the value of all farm products sold. Regardless of these factors, however, all institutions, experimental farms, grazing associations, and other community projects were classified as abnormal farms.

Commercial farms were divided into six groups as follows:

Class	Value of farm products sold
I	$25,000 or more
II	10,000 to $24,999
III	5,000 to 9,999
IV	2,500 to 4,999
V	1,200 to 2,499
VI	250 to 1,199[2]

[2] Provided (1) the farm operator worked off the farm less than 100 days in 1949 and (2) the nonfarm income of the family was less than the value of all the farm products sold.

Other farms were grouped into the following economic classes:

Part-time farms--Farms with a value of farm products sold of $250 to $1,199 and either (1) the farm operator worked 100 or more days off the farm in 1949 or (2) the nonfarm income of the family was greater than the value of farm products sold.

Residential farms--Farms, except abnormal farms, with a value of farm products sold of less than $250. (Operators of some of these farms worked 100 or more days off the farm in 1949. On some farms, the nonfarm income of the family was greater than the value of farm products sold. Others were subsistence and marginal farms of various kinds. Under conditions of lower nonagricultural employment, some of these farms would probably qualify as commercial farms.)

Abnormal farms--Public and private institutional farms, community enterprises, experiment station farms, grazing associations, and the like, if so identified.

To determine the economic classes, the total value of farm products sold had to be computed from entries in various sections of the questionnaire. This figure, like that for horses and mules, was entered on the questionnaire in the position between questions 332 and 333. The code, when determined, was posted on both sides of the questionnaire so the punch card operator could get it easily. It was punched on all cards.

Type of Farm

The major product sold by the farm determined its type. Value of sales or anticipated sales of the selected product had to be at least 50 percent of the total value of farm products sold. Farms whose sales were not concentrated on one product were classified as general farms. Part-time, residential, and abnormal farms were put in a "miscellaneous" category. Factors in the classification of farms by type were:

Classification basis	Value of all farm products sold.
Classification criteria	The sale of products from a particular source had to account for 50 percent or more of the total value of all farm products sold from the farm.
How classification was made	Hand coding by visual inspection of each questionnaire during office processing.
Information used for classification	46 sales items representing sales of an individual product or group of similar products. Some were considered singly and others were grouped.
Kinds of farms not classified by type of farm on the basis of income from a particular source or sources	(a) Part-time farms ($250 to $1,199 sales of farm products and the operator worked off the farm 100 or more days in 1949 or reported that other family income was greater than sales of farm products). A count of these part-time farms was made by type but a tabulation of their characteristics was not made. (b) Residential farms (less than $250 sales of farm products in 1949). (c) Abnormal farms (primarily private and public institutional farms, experiment station farms, Indian reservations, and grazing associations).

The major product, which determined the type of farm, was sometimes an individual crop, such as cotton, or a group of closely related products, such as dairy products. Or, it might be a broad group of products, such as cash grains (corn, sorghum, all small grains, field peas, field beans, cowpeas, and soybeans).

The type of farm code was entered under the economic class code on the questionnaires. It was punched on all cards.

The types of farm and the products which were used to determine them were:

Type	Product or group of products amounted to 50 percent or more of the value of all farm products sold
Cotton	Cotton
Cash grain	Corn, sorghum, small grains, field peas, field beans, cowpeas, and soybeans.
Other field crop	Peanuts, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, tobacco, sugar cane, sugar beets for sugar, and other miscellaneous crops.
Vegetable	Vegetables.
Fruit and nut	Berries and other small fruits, and tree fruits and nuts.
Dairy	Milk and other dairy products. The criterion of 50 percent of the total sales was modified in the case of dairy farms. A farm for which the value of sales of dairy products represented less than 50 percent of the total value of farm products sold was classified as a dairy farm if: (1) Milk and other dairy products accounted for 30 percent or more of the total value of products, and (2) Milk cows represented 50 percent or more of all cows, and (3) Sales of dairy products, together with the sales of cattle, amounted to 50 percent or more of the total sales.
Poultry	Chickens, eggs, turkeys, and other poultry products.
Livestock farms other than dairy and poultry	Cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, goats, wool, mohair, goat milk, and products from animals slaughtered on the farm, provided the farm did not already qualify as a dairy farm.
General	Farms were classified as general when the value of products from one source or group of sources did not represent as much as 50 percent of the total of the value of all farm products sold.
General, primarily crop	Primarily crop farms represent farms for which the sale of one of the following crops or groups of crops--vegetables, fruits and nuts, cotton, cash grains, or other field crops--did not amount to 50 percent or more of the value of all farm products sold, but for which the value of sales for all these groups of crops represented 70 percent or more of the value of all farm products sold.

Type	Product or group of products amounted to 50 percent or more of the value of all farm products sold
General, primarily livestock	Primarily livestock farms are those which could not be classified as dairy farms, poultry farms, or livestock farms other than dairy and poultry, but on which the sale of livestock and poultry and livestock and poultry products amounted to 70 percent or more of the value of all farm products sold.
General, crop and livestock	General crop and livestock farms are those which could not be classified as either crop farms or livestock farms but on which the sale of all crops amounted to at least 30 percent but less than 70 percent of the value of all farm products sold.
Miscellaneous and unclassified farms	This group represents farms that were not classified by type. It includes part-time, residential, and abnormal farms. It also includes miscellaneous types of commercial farms if 50 percent or more of the total value of products was accounted for by sale of horticultural products, or sale of horses, or sale of fur animals, or sale of forest products, or sale of bees and honey.